

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	I	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,067	10/034,067 12/28/2001		John Durbin Husher	2208P	9458
29141	7590	04/09/2004		EXAMINER	
SAWYER	LAW G	ROUP LLP	WILSON, CHRISTIAN D		
P O BOX 51418 PALO ALTO, CA 94303				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	0, 0			2824	
				DATE MAILED: 04/00/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	//
Advisory Action	10/034,067	HUSHER, JOHN DURI	3IN U
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christian Wilson	2824	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addres	s
THE REPLY FILED 19 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appelexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applicable at the same of this application of the same of the sam	cation. A proper reply ch places the applicati	to a on in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moderned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See I 136(a) and the appropriate extension. Fee. The appropriate extension or (2) a	MPEP tension fee ion fee under as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	*		
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);		
(c) ★ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or sim	plifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed ar	nendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were i	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w	• • •	•	ns t
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>9-22</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-8</u> .			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme		0//11	
10. Other:		RICHARD ELMS SUPERVISORY PATENT E TECHNOLOGY CENTER	XAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments are directed against the references individually.